

An Institutional Self Study of the Athletics Program of a National
Collegiate Athletic Association Division III Member Institution

Master's Project

Submitted to the School of Education, University of Dayton in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree Master of Science in
Education

by

Keith Culley
School of Education
University of Dayton
Dayton, Ohio

July 1994

Approved by:

Official Advisor

Table of Contents

| | | |
|-------------|---|----|
| Chapter I | INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| | Need | 1 |
| | Purpose | 2 |
| Chapter II | REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE | 5 |
| | Background Information | 5 |
| | Evaluation Methods | 7 |
| | Accreditation | 9 |
| | Self Study | 12 |
| | Evaluation of Athletic Programs | 19 |
| | Certification of Athletic Programs | 21 |
| | Evaluation of Division III Athletic Programs | 25 |
| Chapter III | METHODOLOGY | 28 |
| Chapter IV | RESULTS | 30 |
| | Institutional Purpose and Athletics Philosophy | 31 |
| | The Authority of the Chief Executive Officer in Personnel and Financial Affairs | 35 |
| | Institutional Control and Accountability of Financial Aid and Athletics Program Finances | 39 |
| | Athletics Program Organization and Administration | 41 |
| | Employment of Athletics Program Personnel | 43 |
| | Sports Programs | 46 |
| | Recruiting, Admissions and Eligibility | 48 |
| | Institutional Student Services | 51 |
| | Student-Athlete Profiles | 55 |
| Chapter V | SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS | 59 |
| | Bibliography | 62 |
| Appendix | NCAA Division III Institutional Self Study Guide | |

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) Constitution 6.3.1 requires that Division III member institutions complete a comprehensive institutional self study and evaluation of their athletics programs at least once every five years. (NCAA Manual 1993) The NCAA further requires that the self study document and supporting documentation be retained on file with the office of the president and be available for examination by an authorized NCAA representative. (NCAA Manual 1993) The self study document is contained in the NCAA Division III Institutional Self Study Guide to Enhance Integrity in Intercollegiate Athletics. (ISSG)

Need

An Ohio NCAA Division III institution was in need of completing such a self study and investigation of its athletics program. The study was needed in part to satisfy NCAA Constitution 6.3.1, but in addition fulfilled a need, as expressed by the institution's recently appointed director of athletics, to establish a benchmark as to the current state of the athletics program. Lastly, this director had taken over leadership of men's and women's athletic programs which were previously headed by separate athletic directors. Such an institutional self study was thus needed to help facilitate the process of merging previously autonomous departments of men's and women's athletics.

Purpose

The purpose of the institutional self study, in addition to satisfying NCAA Constitution 6.3.1, is to assist a Division III member institution in assessing the role of athletics in its educational mission. (NCAA 1985) The role of athletics is defined by the NCAA in its philosophy statement of Division III which is found in Division III Membership Requirements of the NCAA Manual. (NCAA Manual 1993) This statement reads as follows:

"Colleges and universities in Division III place highest priority on the overall quality of the educational experience. In so doing, they seek to strengthen the integration of objectives and programs in athletics with academic and developmental objectives and to assure the integration of athletes with other students."

"Division III member institutions place special importance on the impact of athletics on the participants rather than spectators and place greater emphasis on the internal constituency (students, alumni, and special friends) than on the general public and its entertainment needs." (NCAA Manual 1993)

The importance of the self study investigation is that it provides a self study document for a Division III institution that emphasizes the Division III philosophy statement. This study involved senior level administrators both inside and outside of the department of athletics and enhanced their knowledge of athletically related activities. Senior level

administrators were made aware of the strengths and weaknesses in their athletics program. The self study identified issues or concerns that should become topics for more detailed inquiry by administrators and other personnel within the institution.

Implications of the study included the identification of any compliance problems with NCAA policy. The study determined whether documentation or records existed to substantiate certain procedures, or if current practices needed to be more widely publicized. The study identified a need to formalize policies and/or procedures that generally were followed but that could be misapplied by some persons or in some circumstances.

The author's interest in conducting the study was persuaded by a serious career goal of moving into collegiate athletic administration. The experience provided a greater understanding of Division III philosophy and practice. The Study also provided a scholarly and institutional perspective which was of educational value in the pursuit of career goals and further post graduate work.

The investigator, employed outside of the institution, lent a measure of objectivity to the study and provided for the athletic director and other senior administrators an unbiased, objective review of the data. This because there are problems with an institutional self study on its own as explained in the Guide for Self Study and Evaluation of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (1985) First, there is the question as to who plays the " devils advocate" or is charged with the role of "loyal opposition." (North Central Association 1985) Secondly, compilers of a self study normally have no acquired skills in institutional evaluation, neither in the sense of training, nor in the sense of having had the opportunity to approach other institutions from this perspective. (North Central Association 1985) And third, institutions could be inclined or tempted to remain silent about weaknesses. (North Central Association 1985).

Adequate representation of all major institutional perspectives was provided by working closely with athletics department personnel and those persons charged with the responsibility of overseeing the athletics program. Those people included the director of athletics, the coordinator of men's athletics and the coordinator of women's athletics.

Findings of the study are confidential and therefore within this study no identification of the institution will be made.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The literature review is divided into sections as it relates to the following: background information, evaluation methods, accreditation, self study, evaluation of athletic programs, certification of athletic programs, and evaluation of Division III athletic programs.

Background Information

Until recently there has been no practice of evaluation of intercollegiate athletic programs. Athletic programs have operated as separate entities within academic institutions. As a result, intercollegiate athletics have generated some of the most scandalous and difficult problems facing colleges and universities in the past ten years. The mass media have exposed horrific problems such as illegal recruiting, compromised admissions standards, gambling and point shaving, drug abuse, and athletes being kept eligible with nonacademic courses. (Davis 1987)

In 1983 Barbara S. Uehling identified two crucial factors in collegiate athletics: revenues and the innate human compulsion to compete. (Uehling 1983) She stated that all of the problems of college

athletics were related to financial pressures, with an inequity existing between revenue generating and rule setting institutions. (Uehling 1983) The largest rule setting institution by membership, and thus the most influential, is the National Collegiate Athletic Association, or NCAA. (Falla 1981)

By 1987, Ira Michael Heyman, chancellor of the University of California at Berkeley, and a member of the President's Commission of the NCAA, stated, "It doesn't take too much imagination to recognize there is now sufficient imbalance between athletics and academic programs." (Lederman, 1990) He goes on to say, "It is our responsibility, not anyone else's, to deal with regaining a proper balance." (Lederman 1990)

Robert H. Atwell, president of the American Council on Education, suggested in a speech at the National Forum of the NCAA on January 11, 1988, that in order to restore public confidence in intercollegiate athletics it was necessary to address a set of serious systemic problems. (Atwell 1987) Atwell recognized that the President's Commission had applied tougher sanctions and that the NCAA had added additional enforcement resources, but stated that they were not long term solutions. (Atwell 1987) He stated that efforts to keep college sports programs free of scandal were being overpowered by economic and social forces. (Atwell 1987) He identified problems to include an overemphasis on

winning, over concern with spectators, a tolerance for academic compromises, and a tendency to link athletic accomplishments with institutional quality and prestige. (Atwell 1987) Atwell cited the media as feeding this sports craze, as well as economic realities which often tempted people to cut the rule book corners.

Because regular institutional evaluations tend to exclude athletic departments, few universities and colleges critically examine the functioning of their athletics programs and the relationship of sports to their institutions' educational missions. (Davis 1987) Barbara Gross Davis states that even if the athletic program functions as a separate entity, it is best evaluated in a manner consistent with the practices for evaluating other campus programs. (Davis 1987) Although there is no agreement on the best methods to conduct or use evaluation in higher education, according to Shapiro, basic principles exist. (Shapiro 1986)

Evaluation Methods

Program evaluation and program review refer to those activities in which judgements are made about initial program performance and priorities for the future which is formative evaluation; or about the longer term success of a program in reaching established goals or performance standards which is summative evaluation. (Wilson 1987)

Formative evaluation is concerned with how to make a program better while summative evaluation is concerned with whether a program has been successful or effective. (Wilson 1987)

Paul L. Dressel, while director of institutional research at Michigan State University, stated that the reputation of a university rests on the reputation of its several departments. (Dressel and Dietrich 1982) He further stated that since the excellence of the university depends ultimately on the excellence of the departments, it is evident that some provision needs to be made for department review and self study. (Dressel and Dietrich 1982) Among reasons for conducting review and self study, Dressel cites the relations among departments. In their digest, "The path to excellence: Quality assurance in higher education," Lawrence R. Marcus and others state that institutional self study is an appropriate method for determining quality and demonstrating accountability, which can lead to academic and administrative excellence. (Marcus et al. 1984)

Richard F. Wilson (1987) of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, in a study of program evaluation in higher education, identifies various approaches to program review. A goal based approach was identified as most popular in higher education largely because of its orderly and rational approach. (Wilson 1987) A responsive approach was identified as minimizing the attention to formal goals and objectives,

focusing instead on the issues and concerns of those who have some stake in the program under review. In this approach, an attempt is made to determine what a program is actually accomplishing and what issues need attention, regardless of the stated goals and objectives. Issues are defined through a series of interviews or surveys with a program's constituencies. (Wilson 1987) A decision making approach to evaluation was noted as emphasizing the linkage between evaluation activities and the information needs of those in decision making roles. Here there is less interest in the formal goals and objectives of a program and in the concerns of the constituencies than in securing information that will enable wise decisions to be made. (Wilson 1987) Lastly, the connoisseurship approach to evaluation was identified as one which takes the form of peer reviews or outside review teams. The essence of this approach is the value placed on the experience and insight of the expert in the field. In the end the connoisseur organizes and analyzes all of the data and provides a report that is based on perceptions of the strengths and weaknesses of a program. (Wilson 1987)

Accreditation

In "A Primer on Institutional Research", Richard D. Howard and the others describe accreditation as a means for self regulation that has evolved as a major force for enhancing academic and educational quality.

(Howard et al. 1987) They describe two types of accrediting agencies, institutional and professional. The authors explain that institutional accrediting agencies are concerned with the institution as a whole and are typically regional agencies. Thus, review of any given institution by one of these agencies is usually conducted by academic and/or administrative staff of various regional institutions. (Howard et al. 1987) The authors explain that professional accreditation, on the other hand, deals with the review of specific programs, and in these cases review teams are staffed by both academic and non-academic personnel. (Howard et al. 1987)

In his article, "Philosophy of Accreditation," in the North Central Association Quarterly, Frederick Crossen describes the nature of accreditation. He states that the evaluation is of systems organized to bring about a desired end, through a process of development, and interest is in the organization of the process, in not only whether, but in how the organized system succeeds or fails. (Crossen 1987) The interest here is in the various ways which and the various degrees to which the planned structure or the organized system succeeds or fails in achieving its goal. (Crossen 1987) Crossen states that assessment is aimed only at determining whether the finished product meets certain standards. (Crossen 1987) He says assessments of the product or outcome may also be employed as a part of the evaluation of the institution or organization, significant only as contributing to the evaluation of the institution and its

undertaking. (Crossen 1987) The interest here is not only in whether the institution is succeeding or failing, but in how or in what ways the institution is succeeding or failing. (Crossen 1987)

Crossen gives three reasons for the use of goals as norms of evaluation for accreditation. First, he cites the question of whether an institution is assisting the appropriate growth of its students in the program which it offers, or whether it is responding only to a perceived social need. (Crossen 1987) Second, he explains that assessing the goals of an institution provides the ground not merely for a pass or no pass decision, but for redirecting and improving its performance. (Crossen 1987) And third, he states that a process may be evaluated on whether or not is appropriately organized to achieve its goals, whether it is in fact achieving them, and is likely to continue to do so. The concern here is not with the goals, but the means and process of attaining them. (Crossen 1987)

The Commission on Institutions of Higher Education conducts its evaluations for candidacy and accreditation both to provide public certification of the quality of the institutions affiliated with it and to encourage their improvement, according to the Guide for Self Study and Evaluation (1984-85) of the North Central Association. (North Central Association 1985)

Self Study

At the heart of the evaluation process for accreditation is the institutional self study. According to the Guide, The Commission has chosen to emphasize institutional self study in its evaluative approach since the thirties because this emphasis has proven to be particularly well suited to the principles to which the Commission is dedicated and particularly useful to institutions themselves. (North Central Association 1985) This guide informs that since the thirties accreditation decisions have been based on evaluation of an institution in terms of its effectiveness in achieving its own appropriate mission and purposes. (North Central Association 1985) So it is logical for the Commission to rely on the institution conducting a self study as the first step in the accreditation process.

Because self analysis is crucial to any institutions' effectiveness, according to the Guide, the Commission has continued to require periodic self study as a part of the accreditation process in an effort to foster institutional improvement. (North Central Association 1985) Such a periodic program of self study is required to establish a basis for Commission evaluations and to foster the attitudes and structures of self analysis that every institution needs to survive. (North Central Association 1985) So it is that self evaluation should be an ongoing part

of every institutions daily life.

In their article, "Institutional Research Support of the Self Study", Howard and others state that a primary purpose of the self study process is a qualitative and quantitative examination and evaluation of the institutions progress towards its mission and meeting its goals and objectives. (Howard et al. 1987) Paul L. Dressel reported that self study has been encouraged by foundation support in addition to the activities of various regional and professional accrediting associations. (Dressel and Dietrich 1982)

The Guide for Self Study and Evaluation discusses the principles of self study. Such principles are important because the Commission does not prescribe the precise nature and form of an institution's self study. This is because members of the Commission realize that structures and methods appropriate to the internal purposes of one institution differ from those appropriate to another. (North Central Association 1985)

Because regional accrediting agencies are concerned with the institution as a whole, the first principle is that the self study must be genuinely institutional in perspective. The second principle is that the self study process and the report growing out of it must be evaluative.

(North Central Association 1985) This principle would certainly apply to a professional accrediting agency or departmental review. The final principle stated in the Guide indicated that the institution must evaluate its programs and environment in terms of the Commission Criteria which is the primary requisite of every self study report. (North Central Association 1985)

While self study is at the heart of accreditation, other aspects of methodology in accreditation must be considered. The first step of the accreditation process is a statement of standards. (North Central Association 1985) These standards must be stated in general terms because of the diversity of higher education, but must be agreed to by member institutions for eligibility and accreditation, according to the Guide. It states further that the language of the standards, like that of the law, rests on accumulated experience and must remain open to changing conditions and to the creative response of human invention. (North Central Association 1985)

The Guide goes on to describe the rest of the steps in the accreditation process. In the second phase, the institution to be evaluated does a self assessment on the basis of the public standards, making its case for accreditation. (North Central Association 1985) The next step involves a visiting team whose role is to supply, on the basis of their

experience, what is necessarily lacking in the statement of standards, namely their interpretation as applicable to this particular institution. (North Central Association 1985) Through this comparative context the overall health of the institution may come into view. The fourth and final phase of the methodical evaluation of institutions is the process of reviewing the team report and the final confirmation by the Commission. (North Central Association 1985)

The importance of standards and a visiting team is supported by Dressel. He states that no adequate self study of a department can be made except as the role of the department in the institution is studied and the quality of the department is compared with that of departments in like institutions. (Dressel and Dietrich 1982) He further states that while it is difficult for the members of a departmental staff to get a frank appraisal of the department from outsiders, it is even more difficult for them to be objective about their own inadequacies and strengths. (Dressel and Dietrich 1982)

There are inherent problems with an institutional self study on its own as explained in the Guide for Self Study and Evaluation. First, there is the question as to who plays the "devils advocate" or is charged with the role of "loyal opposition." (North Central Association 1985) Secondly, compilers of a self study normally have no acquired skills in

institutional evaluation, neither in the sense of training, nor in the sense of having had the opportunity to approach other institutions from this perspective. (North Central Association 1985)

Such problems indicate the need for a visiting team, or, as proposed by Lawrence R. Marcus (1984), the use of outside guidance. Marcus states that once completed, the self study should be reviewed by an impartial, external consultant. (Marcus et al. 1984) He says that the consultant should visit the campus to discuss the issues with program and other faculty, students, and administrators, and then report on whether the stated goals and accomplishments make sense. (Marcus et al. 1984) Marcus maintains that institutions should circulate broadly the consultant's report or candid summary. (Marcus et al. 1984)

In regard to the evaluation of self study results, Howard and others (1987) identified two particular concerns which need to be addressed. The first concern is whether minimal data requirements have been collected, tabulated, and summarized. (Howard et al. 1987) The second concern to be addressed is the interpretation of the results of the study relative to the goals and objectives of the institution. (Howard et al. 1987)

The goal of an accrediting body, as described by Crossen is to determine whether the aforementioned Commission Criteria are adequately fulfilled in the to be accredited program or institution . (Crossen 1987) As to how this goal should be achieved, Crossen states that self study (the major element of linkage to improvement), site visit, review procedures, and final decision are stages which have emerged in the course of time. (Crossen 1987)

Is an accrediting body necessary? Crossen states that many graduate schools currently monitor themselves by periodically doing a self study and inviting in a committee of peer visitors to review their programs and to provide assessments aimed at confirming or improving their quality. (Crossen 1987) In order for this to be adequate, Crossen states that there must be the right motivation, such as the desire for candid evaluation, honest self studies, selection of competent visitors, and so on. (Crossen 1987)

Crossen goes on to point out that the accreditation decision is currently the only external sanction which induces, periodically, an institution to examine its enterprise systematically and as a whole. (Crossen 1987) However, there is an absence of an evaluation of the quality of the educational program or institution beyond the minimum

standards. Howard and others point out that accreditation research requirements result in summative evaluation. (Howard et al. 1987) Outcome assessment and goal based review addresses this issue as does a change to formative evaluation.

Richard F. Wilson states that no one has found a good way of assessing quality. (Wilson 1987) Accreditation as an indicator of quality has come under strong criticism, according to Marcus and others (1984), partially because accrediting bodies assess an institution's quality according to the institution's own mission and self definition. (Marcus et al. 1984) Critics of accreditation point out various problems: The accreditation process has become ingrown, the period of accreditation is lengthy (often ten years), and accrediting associations do not monitor or enforce standards, nor make public those standards that an institution does not meet. (Marcus et al. 1984)

Frederick Crossen reports that self studies are not normally made public, or even disseminated thoroughly in the home institutions. (Crossen 1987) He goes on to say, however, that they are usually taken seriously by the departments involved. (Crossen 1987) So, the result of self evaluation is for home consumption, aimed at self assessment for the sake of improving or confirming quality.

Evaluation of Athletic Programs

The NCAA has recognized the need for evaluation of intercollegiate athletic programs as college presidents became more involved in response to growing concern over problems in athletic departments. The President's Commission, composed of 44 College presidents and chancellors, was created in January 1984 at the NCAA convention. (Lederman 1990) The President's Commission was formed to address concerns about the integrity of college sport with a goal of reducing cheating and increasing institutional control over athletic departments. (Lederman 1990) A committee of The American Council on Education had earlier proposed a board of presidents to have authority to veto or modify NCAA rules on its own. (Farrell 1985) The President's Commission was thus created along lines proposed by the NCAA Council. (Farrell 1985)

The President's Commission called a special convention in June of 1985 to address the issues and made proposals which were adopted by a landslide vote of convention delegates. (Farrell 1985) Among the proposals was a new rule which required each institution to conduct a self study of its sports program every five years as a condition of membership. (Farrell 1985) The self study was compared with those that institutions must conduct for regional accrediting associations. (Farrell 1985) So, college presidents felt that athletic programs should be evaluated in

the same manner as other college programs. The content and format of the self study was determined by the NCAA Council with an effective date of August 1, 1986. (Farrell 1985)

The implementation of the self study of athletic programs was an auspicious beginning as college presidents accepted their role as chief executive officers for athletic programs as well as other portions of their universities. For some though, it was not enough. Hoke Smith, president of Towson State University, said many presidents would like to see the establishment of an accreditation process for athletic departments that would be similar to existing accreditation inspections of institutions. (Lederman 1990) This would ultimately happen.

In his annual state of the association address to the 1990 NCAA Convention, Richard D. Schultz urged the membership to embrace the concept of certification of athletics departments. (Devlin 1993) This was probably due to inherent weaknesses in the self study process done without outside or peer review. Self study by itself was evidently not effective in lessening widely expressed negative views about college sports and the NCAA.

In March of 1991, the Knight Foundation Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics released its first report, "Keeping Faith with the Student-Athlete," in which it endorsed the certification concept. (Devlin 1993) The Knight Commission maintained that college athletics was in such a state of low repute that independent authentication of the academic and financial integrity of each institution's athletics program was essential. (Devlin 1993)

Certification of Athletic Programs

In January of 1993, legislation mandating certification for NCAA Division I institutions was Sponsored by the NCAA convention where it was adopted overwhelmingly. (Devlin 1993)

According to the NCAA Manual, Bylaw 23.01, the central purpose of the certification program is "to validate the fundamental integrity of member institutions' athletics programs through a verified and evaluated institutional self study." (NCAA Manual 1993) The verification and evaluation of the self study gives it increased credibility and will serve to enhance the public image of college sports.

The self study process, according to the NCAA Institutional Self Study Guide, is designed to involve campuswide participation, is intended

to enhance understanding of intercollegiate athletics and, concomitantly, to help move athletics into the mainstream of the academic flow and mission of the institution. (NCAA 1985) This is consistent with the view of Paul L. Dressel, who maintains that department studies have shown that if they are to expect the kind of support they wish from the university, they must indeed become contributing members of the university. (Dressel and Dietrich 1982)

Lawrence R. Marcus and others hold that the greatest safeguard against an increased state role is for colleges themselves to strengthen their own evaluation activities. (Lawrence 1984) Maureen E. Devlin, manager of NCAA Services, states that tangible evidence of the ability of institutions to address problems effectively is crucial to preventing further state and federal intervention in college sports. (Devlin 1993) She also states that the ultimate goal of certification is steady improvement of each institution's athletics program. (Devlin 1993) So, this certification process and self study is one of formative evaluation.

The original self study as generated by the NCAA Council addressed seven major areas involving detailed self study questions in the form of a checklist. (NCAA 1985) With the addition of certification, the Division I self study was changed to cover four major topics. These areas are: Governance and Commitment to Rules Compliance; Academic Integrity;

Financial Integrity; and Commitment to Equity. (Devlin 1993) The first order of business in the governance and compliance area is to confirm that the athletics department is operating within the spirit of the institution's mission statement as well as within its own departmental mission.

(Devlin 1993) The departmental mission will be greatly influenced by the philosophy of the NCAA division to which it belongs as there is a great deal of difference between the philosophy of Divisions I and II and Division III. The main focus in the academic integrity area is to assess whether an institution's student athletes are successfully integrated into the rest of the student body. (Devlin 1993) The major concern in the area of financial integrity is with financial controls over athletics department expenditures. (Devlin 1993) In regard to commitment to equity, the NCAA has recognized that its member institutions could not afford to ignore questions of racial and gender equity on their campuses, given the increased attention to this issue and recent litigation. (Devlin 1993)

Once an institution completes a self study, a peer review team will visit each campus to evaluate the self study process and verify the self study report. (Devlin 1993) The peer review team will visit campus to conduct interviews, review records, tour facilities, and so forth to assess and verify the self study (Devlin 1993)

The Committee on Athletics Certification will decide whether an institution should be certified based on the institution's self study report and the peer review team's report. (Devlin 1993) All certifications results will be made public as an institution will be judged certified, not certified, or certified with conditions. (Devlin 1993) Any institution denied certification will be placed in an NCAA restricted membership category. (Devlin 1993) At the end of a one year restricted membership period an institution that has failed to address specific issues will be declared a corresponding member, and will not be entitled to any membership privileges. (Devlin 1993)

The Certification process for Division I institutions should enhance the ethical conduct of athletic programs. The past several years have shown that one cannot codify conduct where so much is at stake in terms of revenue and outside interests in big time programs. Hopefully, institutions will begin to focus on how they can continually improve the quality of the collegiate experience for student-athletes, for whom their athletics program ought to exist.

A key element in the certification process, like that of the accreditation process, is the notion of continually evolving standards. As accreditation has proven to be a successful method of evaluating academic programs, so should certification prove to be successful in evaluating and

improving athletic programs. Certification is grounded in fundamental operating principles, like accreditation, instead of specific rules. These principles relate to issues of institutional control, integrity, and fairness. (Devlin 1993) The heart of certification, as with accreditation, is the self study, which, by definition is designed to stimulate discussion and reflection about the proper role of athletics within the institution .

The philosophy of NCAA Division II institutions is nearly identical to that of Division I. So it only makes sense to require Division II programs to go through a similar certification process as Division I. Of particular concern is the statement in Division II philosophy, like that of Division I, that the institution "recognizes the dual objectives in its athletics program of serving both the campus and the general public". (NCAA Manual 1993) A certification process would help assure that athletics is held in its proper place within the institution and that the student athlete is treated in the same manner as the rest of the student body.

Evaluation of Division III Athletic Programs

The philosophy statement of Division III institutions is much different than those of Divisions I and II. As stated in the NCAA Manual,

"Colleges and universities in Division III place highest priority on the overall quality of the educational experience. In so doing, they seek to strengthen the integration of objectives and programs in athletics with academic and developmental objectives and to assure the integration of the athletes with other students."

"Division III member institutions place special importance on the impact of athletics on the participants rather than spectators and place greater emphasis on the internal constituency (students, alumni, and special friends) than on the general public and its entertainment needs." (NCAA Manual 1993)

The certification process is not necessary for Division III institutions. The current self study process which they are required by the NCAA to conduct, is an appropriate method for determining quality and demonstrating accountability. The self study will provide information about athletics to administration and faculty and serve to enhance relations between athletics and the rest of the university. Division III institutions are capable of conducting comprehensive, forthright, and decision oriented program evaluations.

While the cost of conducting the self study is a concern that has been expressed by the President's Commission, (Lederman 1990) it is important for a Division III institution to employ an outside consultant to conduct the study. This will assure an objective look at the program, free

of any bias, and lend a measure of credibility to the study. If an outside consultant is not feasible, the study committee should at least include persons who are not members of the department of athletics.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The self study investigation was conducted as directed by the NCAA Division III ISSG manual. All findings are supported with documentation. The Division III ISSG consists of "Yes," "no," or "N/A" questions which the NCAA deems appropriate for study by Division III member institutions. (NCAA 1985) According to the ISSG, each question that is answered "No" or "N/A" identifies an issue or concern that should become a topic for more detailed inquiry by officials of the institution. (NCAA 1985)

The self study required that documents be secured that permitted the investigator to familiarize himself with the institution and its athletic program, such as catalogs; student handbooks; athletic department publications; and written policies, procedures, and criteria relating to all aspects of the athletics program.

Interviews with various officials within the institution were conducted. These persons included the following: director of athletics for men's and women's sports; men's athletic coordinator; women's athletic coordinator; head coaches for men's and women's teams; director of financial affairs; director of tutors, and a sample of male and female

student athletes. It was also necessary to interview financial aid officials primarily responsible for awarding financial aid as well as admissions personnel. Others were interviewed as appropriate, including assistant coaches; trainers; tutors, as made available through the provost's office; athletic equipment managers; and individuals knowledgeable about the origin and development of teams at the institution.

It was also necessary to summarize and analyze all data collected during interviews and inspections and integrate it with hard data. The summary was prepared as a final report, along with documentation supporting all findings, and was turned over to the director of athletics upon completion.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The NCAA Division III Institutional Self Study Guide (Division III ISSG) is designed to assist Division III member institutions in assessing the role of athletics in an institution's educational mission. (NCAA 1992) The Document has been derived from the NCAA Guide to Institutional Self Study that previously has been used by all NCAA member institutions. (NCAA 1992) It is designed specifically to assist Division III member institutions in satisfying the self study requirements of NCAA Constitution 6.3.1. (NCAA 1992) Upon completion of the self study, a Notification of Completion form must be signed by the institution's chief executive officer (CEO) indicating the date of completion and forwarded to the NCAA compliance services office. (NCAA 1992)

The Division III ISSG is divided into the following sections: Institutional Purpose and Athletics Philosophy; The Authority of the Chief Executive Officer in Personnel and Financial Affairs; Institutional Control and Accountability of Financial Aid and Athletics Program Finances; Athletics Program Organization and Administration; Employment of Athletics Program Personnel; Sports Programs; Recruiting, Admissions and Eligibility; Institutional Student Services; Student-Athlete Profiles.

i. Institutional Purpose and Athletics Philosophy

Rationale: Colleges and universities in Division III place highest priority on the overall quality of a student's educational experience. In so doing, they seek to strengthen the integration of objectives and programs in athletics with academic and developmental objectives, and to assure the integration of student-athletes with other students. Division III member institutions place special emphasis on internal constituents (students, alumni and special friends) than on the general public and its entertainment needs. To achieve this end, athletics programs in Division III:

Encourage participation by maximizing the number and variety of athletics opportunities in varsity, junior varsity, club and intramural sports;

Direct athletics programs to consider students first rather than spectators;

Ensure the integration of student-athletes into institutional life;

Support students in their efforts to reach high levels of performance by providing them with adequate facilities, competent coaching and appropriate competitive opportunities with students from similar institutions, and

Give primary emphasis to in-season competition, although institutional goals may encompass competitive excellence in a postseason format.

1. Does the institution have a written statement of philosophy for its athletics program?

Yes: The institution's written statement of philosophy for its athletics program is found in the Statement of Policy on University Athletics which is contained in the faculty handbook.

2. Is the athletics philosophy statement found:

a. in the college mission Statement?

No: The provost of the institution holds the opinion that the college mission statement is not an appropriate place for a statement of philosophy for the athletics program.

b. in other publications that define the purpose and mission of the institution?

No: The philosophy of the athletics program was not found in other publications of the admissions department or athletic department.

c. in the admissions catalog?

No: The director of athletics expressed interest in including the athletics philosophy statement in the admissions catalog in the future.

d. in the financial aid catalog?

No: There was no interest expressed to include the athletics philosophy statement here.

e. in the athletics department's publications?

No: However, the director of athletics has instructed to include an athletics program philosophy statement in sport brochures for the upcoming year.

3. Does the institution's written statement of athletics program philosophy address the following:

- a. an explicit linkage to the educational mission of the institution?

Yes: This is found in section B of the Statement of Policy on University Athletics.

- b. explicit reference to the principles of fair play and amateur athletics competition, as defined by NCAA legislation?

Yes: There is an explicit reference to the principles of fair play and a maintenance of standards equal or superior to those enumerated by the NCAA and conference.

- c. explicit reference to the academic success of student-athletes?

Yes: This is found in section D-6 and section D-2b of the Statement of Policy on University Athletics as well as the conference statement of athletics philosophy.

- d. explicit reference to the health and welfare of student-athletes?

No: This was found in neither the athletics philosophy of the institution or the conference.

- e. explicit reference to the fair and equitable treatment of men and women?

Yes: This is found in section D of the Statement of Policy on University Athletics.

4. Is the institution's written statement of athletics program philosophy reviewed by:

a. the president, or his/her designee?

Yes: The president and provost review the institution's written statement of athletic's program philosophy in it's original form as well as any amendments.

b. the institution's governing board?

Yes: The faculty handbook must be approved by the board. Review of the faculty handbook thus includes review of athletics program philosophy.

c. the faculty or representatives of the faculty, the athletics board, or designated individuals outside the athletics department?

Yes: According to the provost, the Committee on Athletic Policy reviews the athletics program philosophy. Two faculty representatives serve on this committee.

d. all athletics department personnel?

Yes: All faculty receive a faculty manual. any non-faculty athletic department personnel are provided this information by the director of athletics.

e. representatives of the institution's athletics interests?

Yes: These people include the faculty, the Committee on Athletic Policy, and the Board of Trustees.

f. all enrolled student-athletes?

No: The director of athletics has instructed the two assistant athletic directors to address the areas of athletics program philosophy and sportsmanship in the upcoming school year.

ii. The Authority of the Chief Executive Officer
in Personnel and Financial Affairs

Rationale: Division III intercollegiate athletics programs are governed by a wide variety of mechanisms, each responsive to the particular history, mission and circumstances of individual institutions. It is neither necessary nor desirable to expect a standard form of athletics program governance among NCAA legislation are clear. The chief executive officer ultimately is responsible for the athletics program, its resources and its compliance with NCAA regulations. Accordingly, Division III chief executive officers should review their own provisions for delegating authority for athletics program affairs, especially those related to personnel selection and administration, and to program budgeting and accounting.

1. Does the institution have written statements of authority or standard operating procedures that specify that the chief executive officer of the institution has the authority and final responsibility for:

a. appointing all athletics personnel?

Yes: The president has authority and final responsibility for appointing all personnel, according to the official job description of this position. This includes part-time, as well as, full-time appointments.

- b. approving the annual operating budget for the athletics program?

Yes: Through the provost, the president is responsible the board on all items of the budget.

- c. approving policies and standards of conduct for all representatives of the institution's athletics program or interests?

Yes: This is contained in the official job description of the president.

2. Has the institution's governing board (e.g., trustees or regents) explicitly sanctioned the chief executive officer's authority and final responsibility with respect to these issues?

Yes: The official job description sanctions this responsibility.

3. Does the director of athletics report directly to the chief executive officer or to a senior administrator designated by the chief executive officer?

Yes: The director of athletics reports directly to the provost.

4. Does the director of athletics meet regularly with the chief executive officer or with the senior administrator that controls intercollegiate athletics?

Yes: The director of athletics meets with the provost regularly once a month, then as needed. Matters of day to day budget approval are handled by the assistant provost.

5. Is the institution's position on legislative issues upon which the institution must vote at NCAA Conventions (and conference meetings, if applicable) understood and approved by:

a. the chief executive officer?

Yes: This responsibility is included in the job description of the president. The president regularly attends all NCAA Conventions and conference meetings.

b. the faculty athletics representative?

Yes: A faculty representative regularly attends NCAA Conventions and conference meetings. If the president does not attend, he/she meets with representatives to determine votes.

c. the athletics board?

Yes: The faculty representative is a member of the Committee on Athletic Policy.

d. the director of athletics?

Yes: The director of athletics regularly attends NCAA Conventions and conference meetings with the president. They have the opportunity to discuss the institution's position on legislative issues and determine votes at these meetings.

6. Does the chief executive officer regularly review and reaffirm his/her commitment to the institution's written statement of athletics program philosophy?

Yes: According to the provost, the director of athletics does not conduct a formal review, but rather regularly articulates a

commitment to the institution's philosophy of athletics.

7. Is the following information shared routinely with the chief executive officer (or designee) or to the senior administrator or committee that oversees intercollegiate athletics:

- a. reports to the NCAA (and conference, if applicable) regarding possible violations of NCAA and/or conference rules?

Yes: The director of athletics stated that any violation would be reported by the director of athletics to the conference office to get direction and a contact person of the NCAA. The director of athletics would then report to the provost and the president.

- b. performance reviews of athletics personnel?

Yes: According to the provost annual performance reviews go to the provost then to the personnel department.

- c. conference meeting minutes?

Yes: The director of athletics stated that meetings and receives minutes of each meeting.

- d. the institution's regular financial audit, including the intercollegiate athletics program?

Yes: The provost stated that the audit goes to the president and provost and includes the intercollegiate athletics program.

iii. Institutional Control and Accountability of Financial Aid
and Athletics Program Finances

Rationale: The administration of financial aid based upon need and/or academic ability and without the consideration of athletics ability or participation is a principle fundamental to Division III athletics. Also fundamental is the adequate institutional control of intercollegiate athletics programs through institutional control of athletics program finances.

1. Is all financial aid awarded to student-athletes based upon need and/or academic ability, and not upon athletics ability and participation, and are policies and procedures in place to ensure that these awards consistently are made in accordance with all Division III financial aid rules?

Yes: As stated in the Statement of Policy on University Athletics, "Need must be determined on the basis of uniform financial aid methodology, such as the financial aid form of the College Scholarship Service." According to the director of financial aid, conference financial aid directors meet annually to discuss packaging models and review data.

2. Do the director of athletics and director of financial aid review at least annually Division III financial aid rules?

Yes: The director of athletics and director of financial aid report that the current NCAA Manual is provided for the director of financial aid by the director of athletics for review of Division III financial aid rules.

3. Do institutional policies require that all income targeted for the use of the athletics program be processed by an office of the institution that is independent of the athletics program?

Yes: According to the director of athletics all income targeted for the use in the athletics program is processed by the office of the controller.

4. Do institutional policies require that all expenses associated with the operation of the athletics program be reviewed at least annually by an office of the institution that is independent of the athletics program?

Yes: The director of athletics stated that all expenses are reviewed with each request by the purchasing department and controller.

5. Do institutional policies explicitly prohibit athletics department staff from maintaining funds or accounts that are not subject to institutional control and/or review?

Yes: According to the director of athletics all funds or accounts must go through that office and then the business and controller's office.

6. Do institutional policies exist regarding the prior approval and reporting of all athletically related outside income (including amount and source)?

No: No policy exists at this time. The primary source of outside income, as reported by the director of athletics, is instructional camps. Standard operating procedures exist in regard to separate accounting done through the athletic department office and controller's office.

7. Are all coaches made aware of those policies?

No: No policy exists at this time.

iv: Athletics Program Organization and Administration

Rationale: Three general principles of athletics program administration underlie this section. First and foremost is the principle of institutional control of athletics programs. Institutional control is fundamental to integrity in intercollegiate athletics, which promotes fair competition by amateur student-athletes. The second principle is that of direct accountability. In matters relating to athletics program management, responsibilities must be explicit, well-understood and subject to monitoring in accord with clear performance criteria. the final principle is that of administrative awareness: those who administer athletics programs must maintain close personal contact with them.

1. Is the director of athletics responsible for the administration of the athletics program?

Yes: This responsibility is delineated in the Statement of Policy on University Athletics.

2. Do all staff members of the athletics program, including head coaches report to the director of athletics, or his/her designee?

Yes: This is stated in the Faculty Manual.

3. Is the intercollegiate athletics program overseen by an institutional committee or board that represents the athletics program to other institutional constituencies?

Yes: This is done by the Committee on Athletic Policy and Recreation.

4. Is the institutional faculty athletics representative provided with sufficient resources, encouragement and opportunities to be actively involved in carrying out his/her responsibilities?

Yes: Institutional support and funding is provided for the faculty athletics representative to attend NCAA Conventions and conference meetings, according to the faculty representative.

5. Is the faculty, as a whole or through some representative body, kept informed regarding institutional policies and practices affecting the operation of intercollegiate athletics?

Yes: According to the director of athletics, the faculty is kept informed by faculty representatives and the chair of the faculty advisory committee. In addition, the Budget Committee meets with the director of athletics.

6. At least once a year, does the director of athletics or his/her representative meet personally with all student-athletes who are actively participating in intercollegiate athletics (i.e., to administer the Student-Athlete Statement)?

Yes: According to the director of athletics, the two assistant athletic directors meet with every team and have each team member sign the Student-Athlete Statement.

7. Have responsibilities been formally assigned for overseeing all aspects of institutional compliance with NCAA (and conference, if applicable) rules?

Yes: According to the provost, the president and director of athletics oversee all aspects of institutional compliance with NCAA and conference rules. The director of athletics

reported that the Registrar checks transcripts to check eligibility and determines eligibility for each athlete on the roster.

8. During the past year, have all institutional personnel with formal compliance responsibilities received continuing education to reinforce their understanding of existing NCAA (and conference, if applicable) rules?

Yes: According to the director of athletics, these personnel are provided a subscription to the NCAA News and attend NCAA and conference meetings which address rules compliance.

v. Employment of Athletics Program Personnel

Rationale: In the final analysis, integrity in athletics program administration depends on the efforts of directors of athletics, coaches and other athletics program personnel who are personally committed to observing both the letter and the spirit of the rules. Division III institutions can take a major step toward ensuring the success of their athletics programs and avoiding abuses by conscientiously attempting to employ only personnel that are qualified, competent and exhibit integrity. Division III institutions also should emphasize racial diversity and gender equity in the employment of athletics department personnel.

1. Do the institution's hiring practices include affirmative-action guidelines designed to encourage the employment of women and minorities in all athletics programs?

Yes: These practices are contained in the institution's Affirmative Action Plan which is available in the Personnel Department.

2. Is the athletics department actively identifying and recruiting potential women candidates for administrative and/or coaching positions on an on-going basis?

Yes: According to the director of athletics this is accomplished through use of a search committee and practice of utilizing national searches.

3. Does the institution provide resources and encouragement to permit athletics department personnel to participate in professional development and enhancement programs?

Yes: According to the director of athletics, the institutional provides development and enhancement monies for each full-time staff position. This money is supplemented by the athletic department. In addition, each coach may use money from the team budget for these programs.

4. Do the institution's hiring procedures for all athletics program personnel require formal consideration of candidates' willingness and capabilities to abide by KNACK (and conference, if applicable) rules?

Yes: This contained in the job descension for all athletics program personnel, according to the director of athletics.

5. Do the institution's hiring procedures require that the NCAA enforcement department be contacted to determine whether candidates for coaching positions have been involved in past NCAA rules violations?

No: The director of personnel reported that this is not done by that office and the director of athletics reported that it is not done in that office.

6. Do the employment agreements for all athletics program personnel stipulate that the violation of NCAA (and conference, if applicable) rules is prohibited and may result in disciplinary action up to and including termination of employment?

No: The personnel director reported that this is not part of the employment agreement.

7. Does the athletics department provide an opportunity for all coaches to participate in annual (or more frequent) reviews and discussions regarding NCAA (and conference, if applicable) rules?

Yes: The director of athletics reported that coaches attend two conferences meetings a year chaired by an elected person to discuss NCAA and Conference rules, implications of the rules, and to make recommendations to the conference. There is also a liaison between each coaching group and the conference Sport caucus which is made up of all faculty representatives and athletic directors who report to the presidents.

8. Within the past year, has the director of athletics explicitly stressed to all athletics program personnel the necessity to self-report possible KNACK (and conference, if applicable) rules violations to appropriate institutional administrators?

No: The director of athletics reported that this has not been done within the past year.

9. Are there written criteria that specify the factors that will be considered in evaluating the job performance of the director of athletics and all athletics department personnel?

Yes: The provost reported that a personnel evaluation form is used which covers a broad range of matters and is compared against

the job description. Responsibilities are taken into specific account. The same form is used for coaches.

vi. Sports Programs

Rationale: As a condition of membership in Division III, Bylaw 20.11.3 specifies that institutions are required to maintain a balanced sports program. It is important that this balance be reflected by tangible and sustained efforts related to coaching, funding, gender equity and the quality of student life.

1. Does the institution provide adequate coaching and funding for each sport designated as a part of the institution's intercollegiate athletics program?

Yes: A recent study by the director of athletics indicates adequate funding is provided for each sport. This study determined the amount of money provided for each athlete of each team. The provost concurred that adequate coaching and funding is provided for each sport.

2. Within the past two years, has it been determined that equitable opportunities exist for intercollegiate competition in all sports supported by the institution?

Yes: The study conducted by the director of athletics determines that equitable opportunities exist.

3. Has the institution formulated policies aimed at ensuring equitable institutional support for all sports, including a scheduling policy that ensures equitable competition, and fair and equitable financial support that meets the needs of each sports program?

Yes: A scheduling policy ensures equitable competition as described in section E of the Statement of Policy on University Athletics. Fair and equitable financial support is evident as a result of the study done by director of athletics.

4. Has the institution formulated policies aimed at addressing the equitable allocation of resources to meet the needs of all students (male and female) based on the institution's undergraduate enrollment and level of interest?

Yes: These policies are maintained as standard operating procedures based on the number of athletes in each sport, according to the director of athletics.

5. Has the institution established adequate controls to monitor missed class time and required days off pursuant to Constitution 3.2.4.11, Bylaws 17.1.6 and 17.1.7?

Yes: The faculty handbook states that student athletes may miss two classes for athletics without penalty. After that, any penalties for missing class is left to the discretion of the instructor. Required days off are enforced according to the director of athletics.

6. Has the institution established procedures, such as exit interviews, to assess the quality of the student-athlete experience?

No: Exit interviews are conducted in the academic office.

vii. Recruiting, Admissions and Eligibility

Rationale: Institutional self-study efforts should be devoted to ensuring sustained dedication to the spirit, as well as the letter of the NCAA's recruiting, admissions and eligibility rules. By focusing on these topics, institutions will reexamine their ultimate dedication to the academic success of their student-athletes.

1. Does the institution have written policies governing the recruitment of student-athletes by all representatives of the institution's athletics program interests?

No: According to the admissions director, no designation is made in regard to student-athletes. All students are recruited in the same manner. The procedure includes a recruitment letter, a questionnaire, an interview, and a tour of campus, all handled through the admissions department. Also, the admission director meets with coaches once a year to ensure a clear understanding of expectations regarding minimum standards.

If "NO" was checked, skip to item 3.

3. Are all expenses associated with the recruitment of prospective student-athletes reviewed on a timely basis and processed pursuant to regular institutional financial procedures?

Yes: The admissions director reported that all expenses are processed through the admissions department, then business and controller's offices.

4. Are all decisions regarding the admission of prospective student-athletes made by institutional personnel who are not affiliated with the athletics program?

Yes: According to the Statement of Policy on University Athletics, "Only regularly assigned admissions officers will discuss admission possibilities officially with applicants."

5. Are all decisions regarding the packaging of financial aid for student-athletes made by institutional personnel who are not affiliated with the athletics program?

Yes: As stated in the Statement of Policy on University Athletics, "Only regularly assigned Student Aid Officers will discuss financial aid with applicants and only these individuals will make commitments with reference to any aspect of aid, including employment. Only written assurance from the Director of Student Aid will be valid."

6. Has the institution established a system for verifying and monitoring the eligibility of all student-athletes?

Yes: The registrar utilizes a tracking system on computer to keep abreast of grade point average and full-time status, as well as number of terms completed. The registrar alerts the director of athletics of any student athlete on probation, suspension, or dismissal. According to the registrar a student is placed on academic probation when his/her grade point average drops below 2.0. According to the Statement of Policy on University Athletics, "a student on academic probation may participate in intercollegiate athletics only after consultation with the student's adviser and the dean of students, or the dean's representative."

7. Does the institution's system for checking the eligibility of student-athletes contain the following provisions:

- a. a procedure for ensuring that the institution's "good academic standing" requirements are being observed?

Yes: According to the registrar, a probation scan on computer generates a list of students on probation per sport season.

- b. A procedure for ensuring that course "drops" that might adversely affect eligibility are flagged for immediate action by athletics program staff?

Yes: The registrar stated that all drops are flagged for immediate action. Once a week for the first three weeks of a term, the registrar scans for any changes from full-time to part-time status.

- c. a procedure for ensuring the accuracy and acceptability of any credits and grades earned from other educational institutions, including credits/grades earned in summer and/or correspondence courses?

Yes: According to the registrar, a student must fill out a Request to Transfer Credit form, which must be approved by the registrar and provost. All transfer mathematics courses must have the approval of the Mathematics Department Chair, as stated on the form. It is also noted on the form that for approval to count any course toward a student's major, he/she must ask the appropriate department chairperson to note approval.

- d. a procedure for ensuring the accuracy and completeness of records of prior athletics competition upon which determinations of eligibility are based?

Yes: The registrar reported that a historical record of seasons participated is maintained, so that any fifth season participation will be caught. The registrar is also notified of any drops from rosters by the athletic department. This was confirmed by the director of athletics.

8. Are all determinations of eligibility made or reviewed and certified by institutional personnel who are not affiliated with the athletics program?

Yes: All determinations of eligibility are made by the registrar, according to the director of athletics.

viii. Institutional Student Services

Rationale: As a general rule, Division III student-athletes should have access to the same range of support services available to all students. Because of the special demands made on student-athletes' time (e.g., as a result of athletics practice and competition), it may be necessary to make special arrangements to ensure that they can take full advantage of some services, especially those designed to promote their successful academic performance. However, special arrangements for providing support services to student-athletes should not be segregated simply because they have chosen to engage in intercollegiate sports competition.

1. Does the institution ensure that the following support services are available to all students, including its student-athletes:
 - a. orientation to college life?

Yes: A student orientation program, called New Student Days, is mandatory for all students to attend. Student athletes must be excused from practice to attend according to the dean of students. This program provides an introduction to the school and testing for placement. Student-athletes are incorporated into the process of students and students are grouped by advisors, according to the dean of students.

b. orientation to the campus?

Yes: The New Student Days Program includes orientation to campus.

c. personal academic tutoring?

Yes: According to the dean of students, every department has tutors. These tutors may be assigned by a faculty member or the student may contact a tutor from a list at the department office. Tutors are also available through the Writers Workshop, language lab, and Math Workshop.

d. counseling for academic problems?

Yes: The dean of students reported that two counselors on campus are readily available to any student.

e. counseling for personal problems?

Yes: Counselors on campus address personal problems, as stated by the dean of students. Also, the dean of students has invited every returning male athlete to participate in a program addressing date rape, alcohol, making it academically, and drug abuse. This program would start on campus, then expand to area high schools. This program is endorsed by the director of athletics.

f. sex education?

No: According to the dean of students no formal sex education program is in place. However, there is a support system dealing with questions regarding sexuality. Also, each student is required to attend a program during New Student Days which addresses acquaintance rape.

g. counseling regarding gambling problems?

Yes: According to the dean of students an gambling problem may be self referred or require referral.

h. counseling regarding summer and/or postgraduation job opportunities?

Yes: This is done through the Career Placement Center, according to the dean of students.

i. counseling regarding eating disorders?

Yes: A general program on eating disorders is available for all students through the Student Life Office. The dean of students stated that counseling is also available through the counseling center and referral to off campus programs.

2. Does the institution offer a formal educational program on drug and alcohol awareness for all students?

Yes: A one credit course is offered each term, or three times a year, on drug and alcohol awareness. also, according to the dean of students, a student must attend a drug and alcohol program on a second offense depending on the nature of the

offense. A serious offense would require attendance at such a program on the first offense.

3. Does the institution's drug/alcohol-awareness education program contain the following provisions:

a. is it conducted at least annually?

Yes: According to the dean of students, programs are offered each year during Alcohol Awareness Week. Legal issues are covered in the student handbook as well as the effects of drugs and alcohol.

b. does it encourage the attendance of all enrolled student-athletes?

No: Student athletes are not encouraged to attend any more than any other student. However, the dean of students indicated that a program called On Campus Talking About Alcohol.

c. does it encourage the attendance of all coaches, trainers and team physicians?

Yes: The dean of students reported that coaches, trainers, and the team physician attend this program.

4. Does the institution inform student-athletes of other available support services?

Yes: According to the dean of students, all students informed of other available support services, including student-athletes.

ix. Student-Athlete Profiles

Rationale: As a part of reasonable efforts to identify areas for improvement in the athletics program, as well as to deter possible abuses, Division III institutions should monitor certain aspects of their athletics programs. The following items suggest possible topics that should be monitored.

1. Does the institution admit all students pursuant to normal institutional admissions requirements?

Yes: As stated in the Statement of Policy on University Athletics, "Uniform standards will be maintained for all students with no exceptions for athletes or others because of specific talents or skills."

2. If the answer to Question No. 1 is yes, does the institution regularly collect and assess the following data for all such students:

- a. class enrollments, including drops?

Yes: The registrar sends a name by name list to each instructor at the beginning of the term, end of the second week, midterm, and the final week. The registrar alerts the athletic office of any midterm D or F. All drops are flagged for immediate attention by the registrar.

- b. class attendance?

Yes: According to the registrar, the professor notes on the class roster if a student is not attending class. The student is then notified to contact the registrar's office to clear up the problem. At the end of the third week of each term, the registrar sends a schedule verification to all students.

c. midterm grades?

Yes: The registrar reports that midterm grades are sent to the athletics department.

d. final grades?

Yes: This information is sent to the athletic department after final grades have been transcribed, according to the registrar.

e. progress toward a degree?

Yes: The registrar conducts a degree audit once a year for all students.

3. Does the institution periodically collect and assess the following data for all enrolled student-athletes:

a. class enrollments, including drops?

Yes: This data is collected and assessed for all students, including student-athletes, by the registrar.

b. final grades?

Yes: Again, this data is collected and assessed for all students, including student-athletes, by the registrar.

c. injuries?

Yes: According to the director of athletics, data is collected and assessed regarding injuries by the athletic trainers.

Findings

As a result of conducting this study it was found that a predominant number of questions were answered "Yes." This institutional self study contained a total of ninety-seven (97) questions. Of these, eighty (80) were answered "Yes" and seventeen (17) were answered "No." According to the Institutional Self Study Guide each question that is answered "No" identifies an issue or concern that should become a topic of more detailed inquiry by the institution. (NCAA 1992)

Of the seventeen questions which were answered "No", action is currently underway in five areas which will change the answers to "Yes" within a year. Two "No" answers were identified as appropriate by university officials. In regard to the question of whether the athletics philosophy statement is found in the college mission statement, the question was answered "No", but the provost holds that it is not appropriate to include athletics philosophy in the college mission statement.

The question which asked whether the institution has written policies governing the recruitment of student athletes by all representatives of the institution's athletic program interests was answered "No". However, the director of admissions feels strongly that it would be inappropriate to have a written policy governing the recruitment of student athletes that is different than that of other students. The director of admissions maintains that such policy would not be consistent with the institution's mission statement or athletics program philosophy, as well as, NCAA Division III philosophy. This position is held by the director of athletics also.

Ten questions which were answered "No" have not yet been addressed.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this NCAA Institutional Self Study was to satisfy the requirement of NCAA Consitution 6.3.1 that Division III member institutions complete a comprehensive self study of their athletics programs at least once every five years. This study also served the purpose of assisting this institution in assessing the role of athletics to its educational mission. Finally, it served the purpose of establishing a benchmark as to the current state of the athletics program for a recently appointed director of athletics.

The procedure for conducting the self study was to gather all information called for by the NCAA Division III Institutional Self Study Guide. This study guide consists of "Yes, No, N/A" questions deemed appropriate for study by Division III member institutions. In this particular study each question was answered "Yes" or "No" after all major

institutional perspectives were considered. All data collected during interviews and inspections was analyzed and integrated with hard data.

The following represents a summary of data provided in Chapter IV. In the main, this institution is in compliance with NCAA rules and is committed through its philosophy on university athletics and in practice, to the NCAA Division III philosophy statement.

There are areas where action is underway to change policy and/or practice to be more in line with guidelines as delineated in the Division III Institutional Self Study Guide. Within the next year athletic philosophy should appear in the admissions catalog as well as sport brochures. Consideration is being given to the proposal of institutional policies regarding the prior approval and reporting of all athletically related income.

Assistant athletic directors will address the institutions athletics philosophy as well as sportsmanship with all enrolled student athletes in the upcoming school year. The director of athletics recognizes the need to explicitly stress to all athletics program personnel the necessity to self-report possible NCAA and conference rules violations to appropriate institutional administrators.

Areas that need further investigation include the question of whether the athletics philosophy statement should appear in the financial aid catalog, or in publications that define the purpose and mission of the university. It should be considered whether an explicit reference to the health and welfare of student athletes should be addressed in the institution's written statement of athletics program philosophy.

Hiring procedures should be assessed to consider whether the NCAA

enforcement department should be contacted to determine whether candidates for coaching positions have been involved in past NCAA rules violations. Employment agreements for all athletics program personnel should be evaluated to determine if there should be a stipulation that violation of NCAA and conference rules is prohibited and may result in disciplinary action up to and including termination of employment. The exit interview format should be evaluated to determine the need for including an assessment of the student-athlete experience. It should be considered whether all enrolled student athletes should be encouraged to attend the institution's formal education program on drug and alcohol awareness.

In conclusion, this institution is clearly committed to the statement of NCAA Division III philosophy. There is a clear commitment to maintaining standards as enumerated by the NCAA and the conference. Finally, there are only a small number of areas which have been identified as in need of further inquiry.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Atwell, Robert H. (1987). Putting College Sports in Perspective: Solutions for the Long Term. AAHE-Bulletin; 40, 7-10.

Crossen, Frederick (1987). The Philosophy of Accreditation. North Central Association Quarterly; 62.

Davis, Barbara Gross (1987). Beyond Ws and Ls: Evaluating Intercollegiate Athletics Programs. New Directions for Institutional Research; 14 37-47.

Devlin, Maureen E. (1993). Occasional Paper. Washington D.C.: Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges.

Dressel, Paul L. and Dietrich, John E. (1982). "Departmental Review and Self Study." in Richard H. Quay (comp.), On Programs and Principles in the Evaluation of Higher Education: A Bibliography of Paul L. Dressel. Monticello, IL: Public Administration Series Bibliography.

Falla, Jack. (1981). NCAA. The Voice of College Sports: A Diamond Anniversary History, 1906-1981. 1st ed. Mission, Kansas. National Collegiate Athletic Association.

Farrell, Charles S. (1985). NCAA Votes Tougher Rules, Penalties. Chronicle of Higher Education; 30, 1&19.

Hanford, G.H. (1979). Controversies in College Sports. Educational Record, 60, 351-366.

Howard, Richard D. et al. (1987). In John Muffo and Gerald W. McLaughlin (eds.), A Primer on Institutional Research, Tallahassee, FL.: Association for Institutional Research.

Lederman, Douglas. (1990). Presidents Need More Power In NCAA. Panel of Retired College Chiefs Says. Chronicle of Higher Education; 36, A37,39.

Marcus, Lawrence R. et al. (1984). Self Study in Higher Education: The Path to Excellence. ERIC Digest 84-1. Association for the Study of Higher Education.; ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education.

National Collegiate Athletic Association. Guide to Institutional Self Study to Enhance Integrity in Intercollegiate Athletics. Mission, Kansas: National Collegiate Athletic Association, 1985.

National Collegiate Athletic Association Institution. Self Study Guide To Enhance Integrity In Intercollegiate Athletics. Mission, Kansas: National Collegiate Athletic Association, 1992.

National Collegiate Athletic Association. NCAA Manual. Mission, Kansas: National Collegiate Athletic Association, 1993.

North Central Association of Colleges and Schools. A Guide for Self Study and Evaluation. Chicago, IL. Commission on Institutions of Higher Education, 1984-85.

Shapiro, J.Z. (1986) Evaluation Research and Educational Decision-Making. In J.C. Smart (ed.), Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research. Vol. 2. New York: Agathon Press.

The New Rules Adopted by NCAA. Chronicle of Higher Education, 30, 21, 1985.

Uehling, Barbara S. (1983) Athletics and Academe: Creative Divorce or Reconciliation? Educational Record, 64, 13-15.

Wilson, Richard F. (1987) "Program Evaluation in Higher Education." in John A. Muffo and Gerald W. McLaughlin (eds.), A Primer on Institutional Research. Tallahassee, FL.: Association for Institutional Research.

APPENDIX

**NCAA
DIVISION III
INSTITUTIONAL SELF-STUDY GUIDE
TO ENHANCE INTEGRITY
IN INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS**

NCAA Constitution 6.3.1 requires that Division III member institutions complete a comprehensive self-study of their athletics programs at least once every five years. When the self-study is completed, the Notification of Completion form must be signed by the institution's chief executive officer (CEO) indicating the date of completion and forwarded to the NCAA compliance services office. NOTE: The completed guide does not need to be submitted to the NCAA. It must, however, be available for inspection on request by NCAA representatives.

Questions or comments about this guide should be directed to the NCAA's compliance services office, 6201 College Boulevard, Overland Park, Kansas 66211-2422.

NOTIFICATION OF COMPLETION

OF

INSTITUTIONAL SELF-STUDY

This form is to be returned by the institution's chief executive officer upon completion of the institution's self-study and evaluation of its intercollegiate athletics program required at least once every five years in accordance with NCAA Constitution 6.3.1. Please note that only this form, not the completed self-study document, is to be returned to the NCAA national office. The completed self-study document and supporting documentation are to be retained on file with the institution and be available for examination upon request by an authorized NCAA representative.

This is to certify that _____
(institution)

has completed a comprehensive self-study and evaluation of its intercollegiate athletics programs using the Institutional Self-Study Guide (ISSG) in accordance with the provisions of NCAA Constitution 6.3.1. It is understood that a report of the self-study and supporting documentation are available for examination upon request by an authorized representative of the NCAA.

Signature Of Chief Executive Officer

Print Or Type Name

Date ISSG Was Completed

Return to: John H. Leavens
Assistant Executive Director
Compliance Services
NCAA
6201 College Boulevard
Overland Park, Kansas 66211-2422

Table of Contents

| | <u>Page</u> |
|--|-------------|
| Introduction to the Institutional Self-Study Guide | 1 |
| I. Institutional Purpose and Athletics Philosophy | 3 |
| II. The Authority of the Chief Executive Officer in Personnel and Financial Affairs | 6 |
| III. Institutional Control and Accountability of Financial Aid and Athletics Program Finances | 8 |
| IV. Athletics Program Organization and Administration | 9 |
| V. Employment of Athletics Program Personnel | 11 |
| VI. Sports Programs | 13 |
| VII. Recruiting, Admissions and Eligibility | 14 |
| VIII. Institutional Student Services | 16 |
| IX. Student-Athlete Profiles | 18 |

I. Institutional Purpose and Athletics Philosophy

Rationale: Colleges and universities in Division III place highest priority on the overall quality of a student's educational experience. In so doing, they seek to strengthen the integration of objectives and programs in athletics with academic and developmental objectives, and to assure the integration of student-athletes with other students. Division III member institutions place special importance on the impact of athletics on participants rather than on spectators and place greater emphasis on internal constituents (students, alumni and special friends) than on the general public and its entertainment needs. To achieve this end, athletics programs in Division III:

- Encourage participation by maximizing the number and variety of athletics opportunities in varsity, junior varsity, club and intramural sports;
- Direct athletics programs to consider students first rather than spectators;
- Ensure the integration of student-athletes into institutional life;
- Support students in their efforts to reach high levels of performance by providing them with adequate facilities, competent coaching and appropriate competitive opportunities with students from similar institutions, and
- Give primary emphasis to in-season competition, although institutional goals may encompass competitive excellence in a postseason format.

1. Does the institution have a written statement of philosophy for its athletics program?

☐ Yes ☐ No

2. Is the athletics philosophy statement found:

a. in the college mission statement?

☐ Yes ☐ No

b. in other publications that define the purpose and mission of the institution?

☐ Yes ☐ No

c. in the admissions catalog?

☐ Yes ☐ No

d. in the financial aid catalog?

☐ Yes ☐ No

e. in the athletics department's publications?

☐ Yes ☐ No

3. Does the institution's written statement of athletics program philosophy address the following:

a. an explicit linkage to the educational mission of the institution?

☐ Yes ☐ No

b. explicit reference to the principles of fair play and amateur athletics competition, as defined by NCAA legislation?

☐ Yes ☐ No

c. explicit reference to the academic success of student-athletes?

☐ Yes ☐ No

d. explicit reference to the health and welfare of student-athletes?

☐ Yes ☐ No

e. explicit reference to the fair and equitable treatment of men and women?

☐ Yes ☐ No

4. Is the institution's written statement of athletics program philosophy reviewed by:

a. the president, or his/her designee?

☐ Yes ☐ No

b. the institution's governing board?

☐ Yes ☐ No

c. the faculty or representatives of the faculty, the athletics board, or designated individuals outside the athletics department?

☐ Yes ☐ No

d. all athletics department personnel?

☐ Yes ☐ No

e. representatives of the institution's athletics interests?

☐ Yes ☐ No

f. all enrolled student-athletes?

☐ Yes ☐ No

II. The Authority of the Chief Executive Officer in Personnel and Financial Affairs

Rationale: Division III intercollegiate athletics programs are governed by a wide variety of mechanisms, each responsive to the particular history, mission and circumstances of individual institutions. It is neither necessary nor desirable to expect a standard form of athletics program governance among NCAA member institutions. However, the authority and responsibility of the chief executive officer under NCAA legislation are clear. The chief executive officer ultimately is responsible for the athletics program, its resources and its compliance with NCAA regulations. Accordingly, Division III chief executive officers should review their own provisions for delegating authority for athletics program affairs, especially those related to personnel selection and administration, and to program budgeting and accounting.

1. Does the institution have written statements of authority or standard operating procedures that specify that the chief executive officer of the institution has the authority and final responsibility for:
 - a. appointing all athletics personnel?
☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
 - b. approving the annual operating budget for the athletics program?
☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
 - c. approving policies and standards of conduct for all representatives of the institution's athletics program or interests?
☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
2. Has the institution's governing board (e.g., trustees or regents) explicitly sanctioned the chief executive officer's authority and final responsibility with respect to these issues?
☐ Yes ☐ No
3. Does the director of athletics report directly to the chief executive officer or to a senior administrator designated by the chief executive officer?
☐ Yes ☐ No
4. Does the director of athletics meet regularly with the chief executive officer or with the senior administrator that controls intercollegiate athletics?
☐ Yes ☐ No

5. Is the institution's position on legislative issues upon which the institution must vote at NCAA Conventions (and conference meetings, if applicable) understood and approved by:

a. the chief executive officer?

☐ Yes ☐ No

b. the faculty athletics representative?

☐ Yes ☐ No

c. the athletics board?

☐ Yes ☐ No

d. the director of athletics?

☐ Yes ☐ No

6. Does the chief executive officer regularly review and reaffirm his/her commitment to the institution's written statement of athletics program philosophy?

☐ Yes ☐ No

7. Is the following information shared routinely with the chief executive officer (or designee) or to the senior administrator or committee that oversees intercollegiate athletics:

a. reports to the NCAA (and conference, if applicable) regarding possible violations of NCAA and/or conference rules?

☐ Yes ☐ No

b. performance reviews of athletics personnel?

☐ Yes ☐ No

c. conference meeting minutes?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

d. the institution's regular financial audit, including the intercollegiate athletics program?

☐ Yes ☐ No

III. Institutional Control and Accountability of Financial Aid and Athletics Program Finances

Rationale: The administration of financial aid based upon need and/or academic ability and without the consideration of athletics ability or participation is a principle fundamental to Division III athletics. Also fundamental is the adequate institutional control of intercollegiate athletics programs through *institutional control of athletics program finances*.

1. Is all financial aid awarded to student-athletes based upon need and/or academic ability, and not upon athletics ability and participation, and are policies and procedures in place to ensure that these awards consistently are made in accordance with all Division III financial aid rules?

☐ Yes ☐ No

2. Do the director of athletics and director of financial aid review at least annually Division III financial aid rules?

☐ Yes ☐ No

3. Do institutional policies require that *all* income targeted for the use of the athletics program be processed by an office of the institution that is independent of the athletics program?

☐ Yes ☐ No

4. Do institutional policies require that *all* expenses associated with the operation of the athletics program be reviewed at least annually by an office of the institution that is independent of the athletics program?

☐ Yes ☐ No

5. Do institutional policies explicitly prohibit athletics department staff from maintaining funds or accounts that are not subject to institutional control and/or review?

☐ Yes ☐ No

6. Do institutional policies exist regarding the prior approval and reporting of all athletically related outside income (including amount and source)?

☐ Yes ☐ No

7. Are all coaches made aware of those policies?

☐ Yes ☐ No

IV. Athletics Program Organization and Administration

Rationale: Three general principles of athletics program administration underlie this section. First and foremost is the principle of *institutional control* of athletics programs. Institutional control is fundamental to integrity in intercollegiate athletics, which promotes fair competition by amateur student-athletes. The second principle is that of *direct accountability*. In matters relating to athletics program management, responsibilities must be explicit, well-understood and subject to monitoring in accord with clear performance criteria. The final principle is that of *administrative awareness*: those who administer athletics programs must maintain close personal contact with them.

1. Is the director of athletics responsible for the administration of the athletics program?

☐ Yes ☐ No

2. Do all staff members of the athletics program, including head coaches, report to the director of athletics, or his/her designee?

☐ Yes ☐ No

3. Is the intercollegiate athletics program overseen by an institutional committee or board that represents the athletics program to other institutional constituencies?

☐ Yes ☐ No

4. Is the institutional faculty athletics representative provided with sufficient resources, encouragement and opportunities to be actively involved in carrying out his/her responsibilities?

☐ Yes ☐ No

5. Is the faculty, as a whole or through some representative body, kept informed regarding institutional policies and practices affecting the operation of intercollegiate athletics?

☐ Yes ☐ No

6. At least once a year, does the director of athletics or his/her representative meet personally with all student-athletes who are actively participating in intercollegiate athletics (i.e., to administer the Student-Athlete Statement)?

☐ Yes ☐ No

7. Have responsibilities been formally assigned for overseeing all aspects of institutional compliance with NCAA (and conference, if applicable) rules?

☐ Yes ☐ No

8. During the past year, have all institutional personnel with formal compliance responsibilities received continuing education to reinforce their understanding of existing NCAA (and conference, if applicable) rules?

☐ Yes ☐ No

V. Employment of Athletics Program Personnel

Rationale: In the final analysis, integrity in athletics program administration depends on the efforts of directors of athletics, coaches and other athletics program personnel who are personally committed to observing both the letter and the spirit of the rules. Division III institutions can take a major step toward ensuring the success of their athletics programs and avoiding abuses by conscientiously attempting to employ only personnel that are qualified, competent and exhibit integrity. Division III institutions also should emphasize racial diversity and gender equity in the employment of athletics department personnel.

1. Do the institution's hiring practices include affirmative-action guidelines designed to encourage the employment of women and minorities in all athletics programs?

☐ Yes ☐ No

2. Is the athletics department actively identifying and recruiting potential women candidates for administrative and/or coaching positions on an on-going basis?

☐ Yes ☐ No

3. Does the institution provide resources and encouragement to permit athletics department personnel to participate in professional development and enhancement programs?

☐ Yes ☐ No

4. Do the institution's hiring procedures for *all* athletics program personnel require formal consideration of candidates' willingness and capabilities to abide by NCAA (and conference, if applicable) rules?

☐ Yes ☐ No

5. Do the institution's hiring procedures require that the NCAA enforcement department be contacted to determine whether candidates for coaching positions have been involved in past NCAA rules violations?

☐ Yes ☐ No

6. Do the employment agreements for *all* athletics program personnel stipulate that the violation of NCAA (and conference, if applicable) rules is prohibited and may result in disciplinary action up to and including termination of employment?

☐ Yes ☐ No

7. Does the athletics department provide an opportunity for all coaches to participate in annual (or more frequent) reviews and discussions regarding NCAA (and conference, if applicable) rules?

☐ Yes ☐ No

8. Within the past year, has the director of athletics explicitly stressed to all athletics program personnel the necessity to self-report possible NCAA (and conference, if applicable) rules violations to appropriate institutional administrators? -

☐ Yes ☐ No

9. Are there written criteria that specify the factors that will be considered in evaluating the job performance of the director of athletics and all athletics department personnel?

☐ Yes ☐ No

VI. Sports Programs

Rationale: As a condition of membership in Division III, Bylaw 20.11.3 specifies that institutions are required to maintain a balanced sports program. It is important that this balance be reflected by tangible and sustained efforts related to coaching, funding, gender equity and the quality of student life.

1. Does the institution provide adequate coaching and funding for each sport designated as a part of the institution's intercollegiate athletics program?

☐ Yes ☐ No

2. Within the past two years, has it been determined that equitable opportunities exist for intercollegiate competition in all sports supported by the institution?

☐ Yes ☐ No

3. Has the institution formulated policies aimed at ensuring equitable institutional support for *all* sports, including a scheduling policy that ensures equitable competition, and fair and equitable financial support that meets the needs of each sports program?

☐ Yes ☐ No

4. Has the institution formulated policies aimed at addressing the equitable allocation of resources to meet the needs of all students (male and female) based on the institution's undergraduate enrollment and level of interest?

☐ Yes ☐ No

5. Has the institution established adequate controls to monitor missed class time and required days off pursuant to Constitution 3.2.4.11, Bylaws 17.1.6 and 17.1.7?

☐ Yes ☐ No

6. Has the institution established procedures, such as exit interviews, to assess the quality of the student-athlete experience?

☐ Yes ☐ No

VII. Recruiting, Admissions and Eligibility

Rationale: Institutional self-study efforts should be devoted to ensuring sustained dedication to the *spirit*, as well as the letter of the NCAA's recruiting, admissions and eligibility rules. By focusing on these topics, institutions will reexamine their ultimate dedication to the academic success of their student-athletes.

1. Does the institution have written policies governing the recruitment of student-athletes by *all* representatives of the institution's athletics program interests?

☐ Yes ☐ No

If "NO" was checked, skip to item 3.

2. Do the institution's written recruiting policies specify:

- a. that NCAA rules regarding acceptable and prohibited recruiting practices be explained at least annually to all recognized athletics support groups (e.g., parents, alumni, friends)?

☐ Yes ☐ No

- b. that all prospective student-athletes (and their parents and high-school coaches, if possible) be informed about NCAA (and conference, if applicable) recruiting rules and the penalties for violation of those rules?

☐ Yes ☐ No

3. Are *all* expenses associated with the recruitment of prospective student-athletes reviewed on a timely basis and processed pursuant to regular institutional financial procedures?

☐ Yes ☐ No

4. Are all decisions regarding the admission of prospective student-athletes made by institutional personnel who are not affiliated with the athletics program?

☐ Yes ☐ No

5. Are all decisions regarding the packaging of financial aid for student-athletes made by institutional personnel who are not affiliated with the athletics program?

☐ Yes ☐ No

6. Has the institution established a system for verifying and monitoring the eligibility of all student-athletes?

☐ Yes ☐ No

If "NO" was checked, skip to next section.

7. Does the institution's system for checking the eligibility of student-athletes contain the following provisions:

- a. a procedure for ensuring that the institution's "good academic standing" requirements are being observed?

☐ Yes ☐ No

- b. a procedure for ensuring that course "drops" that might adversely affect eligibility are flagged for immediate action by athletics program staff?

☐ Yes ☐ No

- c. a procedure for ensuring the accuracy and acceptability of any credits and grades earned from other educational institutions, including credits/grades earned in summer and/or correspondence courses?

☐ Yes ☐ No

- d. a procedure for ensuring the accuracy and completeness of records of prior athletics competition upon which determinations of eligibility are based?

☐ Yes ☐ No

8. Are *all* determinations of eligibility made or reviewed and certified by institutional personnel who are not affiliated with the athletics program?

☐ Yes ☐ No

VIII. Institutional Student Services

Rationale: As a general rule, Division III student-athletes should have access to the same range of support services available to all students. Because of the special demands made on student-athletes' time (e.g., as a result of athletics practice and competition), it may be necessary to make special arrangements to ensure that they can take full advantage of some services, especially those designed to promote their successful academic performance. However, special arrangements for providing support services to student-athletes should not restrict their opportunities to associate with other students; student-athletes should not be segregated simply because they have chosen to engage in intercollegiate sports competition.

1. Does the institution ensure that the following support services are available to all students, including its student-athletes:

a. orientation to college life?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

b. orientation to the campus?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

c. personal academic tutoring?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

d. counseling for academic problems?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

e. counseling for personal problems?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

f. sex education?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

g. counseling regarding gambling problems?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

h. counseling regarding summer and/or postgraduation job opportunities?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

i. counseling regarding eating disorders?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

2. Does the institution offer a formal educational program on drug and alcohol awareness for all students?

☐ Yes ☐ No

3. Does the institution's drug/alcohol-awareness education program contain the following provisions:

a. is it conducted at least annually?

☐ Yes ☐ No

b. does it encourage the attendance of all enrolled student-athletes?

☐ Yes ☐ No

c. does it encourage the attendance of all coaches, trainers and team physicians?

☐ Yes ☐ No

4. Does the institution inform student-athletes of other available support services?

☐ Yes ☐ No

IX. Student-Athlete Profiles

Rationale: As a part of reasonable efforts to identify areas for improvement in the athletics program, as well as to deter possible abuses, Division III institutions should monitor certain aspects of their athletics programs. The following items suggest possible topics that should be monitored.

1. Does the institution admit all students pursuant to normal institutional admissions requirements?

☐ Yes ☐ No

2. If the answer to Question No. 1 is yes, does the institution regularly collect and assess the following data for all such students:

- a. class enrollments, including drops?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

- b. class attendance?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

- c. midterm grades?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

- d. final grades?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

- e. progress toward a degree?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

3. Does the institution periodically collect and assess the following data for all enrolled student-athletes:

- a. class enrollments, including drops?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

- b. final grades?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

c. injuries?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A